DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 288 EC 172 716

AUTHOR Cohn, Ronnie B.

TITLE Transition from Special Education to the World of Work: Recommendations for the State of California.
INSTITUTION Western Regional Resource Center, Eugene, OR.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 14 May 84
CONTRACT 300-83-0185
NOTE 70p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Cooperation; Coordination; Demonstration Programs; *Education Work Relationship; High Schools; Program Development; *Severe Disabilities; State Programs; *Transitional Programs; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS California

ABSTRACT

The paper discusses recommendations for a statewide (California) plan to provide transitional services to severely handicapped high school students. Initial sections trace the state and federal commitment to transitional services for work and other aspects of life. Thirteen model programs in California and eight in other states are summarized. A discussion of curricular aspects addresses philosophical bases (developmental, remedial skills, and functional skills models) and illustrates the use of the Individualized Critical Skills Model, an example of the functional skills approach. Individualized planning is examined in terms of Individualized Educational Programs, individual program plans, and individual transition plans; and case management. Recommendations are further made for demographics, interagency planning/systems change, fiscal policy and legislative actions. A final section lists recommendations for immediate followup, including surveys of special education graduates and evaluation of the effectiveness of interagency agreements. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED257288

Transition from Special Education to the World of Work: Recommendations for the State of California

May 14, 1984

Ronnie B. Cohn

This document was developed by the Western Regional Resource Center, Eugene, Oregon, pursuant to Contract No. 300-83-0185 with the U.S. Department of Education, Special Education and Rehabilitative Services Branch. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education and no endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education should be inferred.

EC173716

Executive Summary

Approximately 30,000 students "graduate" from special education in California each year. This "graduation" does not necessarily reflect completion of a functional curriculum which prepares students for vocational experiences in the community. Instead, students reach the age at which they are no longer eligible for special education. Though their needs for education and training may persist, the guarantee of free, appropriate, public services disappears.

The major problems which affect the special education "graduate", nationally as well as in California, include: low expectations, lack of coordination between special education and agencies responsible for adult services as well as among adult service agencies, and inadequate opportunities for meaningful work experiences. All students face new challenges as they leave school. They may not be adequately prepared for job seeking, job maintenance, or independent living. For students who have severe disabilities, these problems are heightened. The transition period for students leaving special education is not necessarily a problem caused by the students' disabilities. Rather, it is a problem of adulthood for individuals who have been and may continue to be treated as children. Perhaps due to low expectations, there is a paucity of serious

career counseling as well as of vocational preparation as a major curriculum focus at the high school level for students with severe disabilities. Subsequently, as students leave the public school system, vocational training programs, job placement services and assistance in maintaining jobs are not adequately available.

Currently available post high school options for work or day programs for students with severe disabilities typically include: segregated, subsidized programs (such as large institutions, day training and activity centers, adult development centers, work activity programs and sheltered workshops); adult education; community colleges; regional occupational programs; and job placements (which are often limited if not lacking in the community). The agencies which control these options include: Department of Developmental Services, Department of Rehabilitation, Department of Education, Chancellor's Office, and Employment Development Department. Clearly, a major transitional concern is the individual's need to interact with so many different public entities when one is used to functioning within the context of one system only: the schools. In addition, these agencies may or may not coordinate policies, actions, eligiblity criteria and funding considerations. The graduate, therefore, faces a myriad of service options which may or may not include his/her preferred subsequent environment. Added to this confusion are massive unemployment and fiscal disincentives which involve the risk of loss of income supports if the recip-

ient takes even a low paying job.

The transition situation described above appears bleak but can be improved if we are willing to revise, as necessary, both policies and practices which affect graduates of special education. The purpose of this report is to examine the tasks required to accomplish this improvement and to make recommendations for their implementation in California. Toward this end, included herein are: 1) a review of model programs and legislative efforts both in California and nationwide, which are successfully involving high school students with severe disabilities in meaningful work and assisting them in accessing needed support services; 2) definitions of the assumptions and principles underlying expectations for graduates; 3) recommendations for interagency coordination between special education and adult services as well as among public entities involved in the provision of adult services and private entities involved in employment; 4) recommendations for increase exploration of the current and future employment market; 5) recommendations for increased emphasis on vocational preparation at the junior high and high school levels; and 6) discussion of the need for expanded opportunities for meaningful, integrated work experiences for students with severe disabilities who are graduating from special education.

Major recommendations to the California State Department of Education include:

+ A new axiom must become policy- <u>All</u> students

can learn and contribute to society.

+ All special education students must receive vocational education, career education and work experience education in fully integrated environments.
+ All local education agencies must adopt a functional skills approach to determining locally referenced curricula.
+ Individual Transition Plans must be required for each student at least 4 years prior to graduation and parents must be trained toward effective participation in development of ITP's.
+ Statewide data collection must be initiated to facilitate timely and effective transition planning for all students with severe disabilities.
+ The role of community colleges in the education program and transition process must be expanded.
+ Existing interagency agreements must be evaluated against criteria suggested herein.
+ Strong partnerships must be developed between the State Departments of Education, Post Secondary Education, Rehabilitation and private industry.
+ Research in the following areas must be sponsored-

a) effects of vocational education and training programs on the lives of previous and current special education graduates; b) design of successful public/private partnership models; and c) relative correlation of specific criteria to successful transition efforts.

+ Finally, policy, legislation and regulations, where needed, must be developed to mandate implementation of these recommendations.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Definition of Terms 3

National and Statewide Commitment to Transition 4

Model Programs (in California and Other States) 9

Curriculum 24

Individualized Planning 29

Demographic Projections 33

Interagency Planning/Systems Change 35

Fiscal Implications 42

Legislative Implications 47

Next Step Plans 51

Conclusion 54

References 55

Attachment A 60

Attachment B 61

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to develop recommendations for a statewide plan to provide high school students who have severe handicaps transitional services aimed at assisting them in leading successful adult lives. While much of this paper will focus on the world of work, as the title implies, the other aspects of successful living cannot be ignored as all of these affect one's ability to maintain a job as well as to develop a satisfying lifestyle. The dimensions suggested by Wilcox and Bellamy (1982) to evaluate success have also been considered. These are productivity (related to both the social and economic rewards of work), independence and participation in community living.

The value of work in adult living is eloquently discussed by Steinem (1983): "Almost as important as the financial penalty paid by the powerless is the suffering that comes from being shut out of paid and recognized work. Without it, we lose much of our self-respect and our ability to prove that we are alive by making some difference in the world... Unless we see a job as part of every citizen's right to autonomy and personal fulfillment, we will continue to be vulnerable to someone else's idea of what 'need' is and whose 'need' counts the most."

Finally, the basis upon which many of the recommendations in this report have been developed is the work of Marc Gold, who taught us that we must not blame the student who doesn't

learn but rather that we must alter the teaching techniques. His proposed definition of mental retardation (Gold, 1980) is, therefore, an appropriate introduction to this paper as it assumes that all people, regardless of the severity of their disabilities, can learn:

> "Mental retardation refers to a level of functioning which requires from society significantly above average training procedures and superior assets in adaptive behavior on the part of society, manifested throughout the life of both society and the individual. The mentally retarded person is characterized by the amount of power needed in the training process required for her to learn and not by limitations in what she can learn. The height of a retarded person's level of functioning is determined by the availability of training technology and the amount of resources society is willing to allocate and not by significant limitations in biological potential."

Definition of Terms

Severely Handicapped. Definitions of the label "severely handicapped" abound. Recent literature (Brown, Ford, Nisbet, Sweet, Donnellan and Gruenewald, 1983) refers to "approximately the lowest intellectually functioning 1% of the school age population." However, as the severity of an individual's disability appears to vary across environments, those individuals referred to as "severely handicapped" herein are simply those who are labeled as such by the school system in which they participate (as in Wilcox and Bellamy, 1982).

Successful Adult Life. Similarly, "successful adult life" has innumerable implications. Based upon the principle of normalization (Wolfensberger, 1972) and for the purposes of this discussion, "successful adult living" refers to educational, vocational, residential, leisure, medical, transportation and income situations which are culturally normative and valued.

Meaningful Work. As described by Brown, Shiraga, Ford, Nisbet, VanDeventer, Sweet, York and Loomis (1983) "meaningful work" refers to activities which, if not performed by a person who has severe disabilities, must be performed by a nonhandicapped person for money.

National and Statewide Commitment to Transition

On November 3, 1983, at the annual meeting of The Associa- for Persons with Severe Handicaps (TASH), Madeleine Will, Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitation Services of the U.S. Office of Education, acknowledged that "... most severely handicapped students have bleak employment prospects. Joblessness of disabled persons is established to be between 50 and 75 percent. Educational and vocational services designed to lead toward employment are often unavailable or oversubscribed. As a result, transition of severely handicapped students from the structure and security provided by the school to productive, integrated adult life remains extremely difficult."

This concern at the national level is also reflected in the "Education of the Handicapped Act Amendment of 1983." This bill authorizes grants or contracts to "... strengthen and coordinate education, training and related services for handicapped youth to assist in the transitional process to post-secondary education, vocational training, competitive employment, continuing education or adult services."

Similarly, the December 1, 1983 issue of "Handicapped Americans Report" quoted Jean Elder (Commissioner of the Administration on Developmental Disabilities) describing the new federal transition initiative as follows: "The major problem we're trying to address is that disabled people don't

move through the continuum of federal programs... As a result, handicapped people spend their lives inappropriately served in sheltered employment or day activity programs... what we've failed to do is match the supply side- the people who want to work, with the demand side- the private sector. Apart from the failure of federal programs to do their job, an impetus for the jobs project was the growing recognition that severely handicapped people are capable of working in unsubsidized or non-sheltered work." Ms. Elder also cited a study which found that "... a large number of companies and organizations are currently committed to hiring disabled persons and are more than willing to hire the more severely disabled..." and that "...work attitudes among handicapped persons tend to be exemplary, absenteeism low, and productivity high."

In addition, nationwide implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), which was signed into law by President Reagan on October 14, 1982, includes job training for "... any individual who has a physical or mental disability which for such individual constitutes or results in a substantial handicap to employment." State and local JTPA plans can and should include high school students who have severe disabilities. However, vigorous advocacy will be required to ensure participation of these students in the program. A coordinated effort for including these students via interagency planning involves local education agencies, Employment Development Department, Department of Rehabilitation, Regional Centers for the Developmentally Dis-

abled, Area Boards on Developmental Disabilities and private sector employers is currently underway in California. Finally, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482) requires that states spend a designated part of their vocational education grant on programs for students who are labeled "disadvantaged" and "handicapped."

In California, several sections of the Education Code, as well as recent legislation, mandate a commitment to vocational education for special education students. For example:

- Section 56450 mandates that the Superintendent shall annually update and disseminate information to include "... descriptions of effective methods for coordinating career and vocational education services delivered by all of the following, but not limited to, secondary schools, regional occupational centers and programs, community colleges, regional centers for the developmentally disabled, sheltered workshops..."
- Section 56345 states "... when appropriate, the IEP shall also include, but not be limited to, all of the following... 1) prevocational career education for pupils in kindergarten and grades one to six, inclusive, or pupils of comparable chronological age; 2) vocational education, career education, or work experience education, or any combination thereof, in preparation for renumera-

tive employment, including independent living skill training for pupils in grades seven to twelve, inclusive, or comparable chronological age, who require differential performing standards..." (This author recommends that Section 56345 be amended to read that all IEP's shall include such prevocational and vocational education.)

- AB 1892 (Felando) was passed into California State law as Chapter 1099 of the Statutes of 1983. It makes legislative declarations with respect to "low incidence disabilities", a category which may include students with the most severe disabilities, and requires that: the Superintendent of Public Instruction develop, update and disseminate directives of public and private agencies providing services to pupils with low-incidence diabilities; first priority be given by school districts and county offices of education when allocating funds for support services to provide specialized books, materials or equipment needed by pupils with low-incidence disabilities; specialized services for low-incidence disabilities be included in the list of designated instruction and services (Section 56363 of the Education Code).

Finally, legislative efforts continue with regard to transition planning and implementation. One such effort (SB 742) was vetoed by the Governor last year, but advocacy groups are working toward stronger mandates for both integrated educational settings and effective transitional services.

Model Programs

As the current bestseller In Search of Excellence (Peters and Waterman, 1982) describes lessons from America's best-run companies, this section looks at state-of-the-art community-based vocational training and transition programs. Some of these programs are not geared specifically toward students with severe disabilities. Nevertheless, lessons can be learned regarding curriculum, individual planning and interagency coordination. The goal of this report is to make such examples of excellence the rule, rather than the exception, in California.

I. Model Programs in California

A. Project Workability is an employment and training program designed to enable high school students who have special needs to become more employable (see Attachment A regarding disabilities of students). The project provides assessment of students' skills, employment training, work experience and other support services to these students. In addition, Workability coordinates services of the State Department of Education, the Employment Development Department and the Department of Rehabilitation. The State Department of Education is responsible for the overall administration of the project and in fiscal year 1982-1983, 34 local education agencies operated the project at the community level. This coordination has proven

to be successful in both improving services to students with handicaps and enabling participating agencies to avoid costs. Staff from the agencies named above report several instances in which students who might have depended upon public assistance found employment as a result of the project. Perhaps most importantly, the project has improved the attitudes of the students and their parents, teachers, and employers about the ability of students who have handicaps to be employed. During the first year of the project, of those students who graduated or left school after receiving the training, 49% obtained jobs. Of these, 75% were hired by the employers who had provided them with work experience. (For more detailed information, the Auditor General's Report is referenced and available upon request.)

B. Project Interdependence is an innovative demonstration of public/private partnerships with California's youth which encourages the full integration of students with disabilities into all school activities. The primary goal of the project is to demonstrate that effective cooperation between State agencies and the private sector will enhance services to students with disabilities in the California public education system and improve their career choices and employment opportunities. Two major issues which prompted the creation of this project were: 1) the need to save tax dollars (via public/private partnerships) in meeting the needs of those persons eligible for rehabilita-

tion services (who would otherwise be dependent upon state agencies for long-term assistance) and; 2) the need to revitalize traditional approaches to vocational and career education and rehabilitative services by creating opportunities for students, educators, and rehabilitation professionals to work together with leaders in the community and business. Half of the students involved in the project have disabilities and half have no identified disabilities, thereby creating a model of full integration which avoids stereotypes and all other forms of "handicappism." In the first three years of the Project's operation, 18 high school districts have been involved. Perhaps the Director of the State Department of Parks and Recreation, which has participated in the experiential training, sums up the project most succinctly:"Project Interdependence is a highly successful program that is breaking down physical and mental barriers in California. This program enhances the likelihood of a successful and productive life of all participants, high school students and professionals, able and disabled. In short, this investment will provide a long term return that will benefit society as a whole." (For more detailed information, the March 1984 Report to the Legislature is referenced.)

C. San Diego State University is working with local school districts and employers in their communities to provide community-based vocational training programs for students with moderate and severe handicapping conditions. Instead of conduct-

ing vocational assessment and training activities in schools, educators are now providing students with instruction at job stations in community business environments. Job stations refer to environments in which a teacher instructs students in job and job related skills and attitudes in natural work environments on a regular basis. (The identification of job environments and the development of a cooperative arrangement of reciprocal benefit to both parties involved is crucial in the process.) Vocational experiences in this program include hospital settings, retail stores and theatres. School districts typically provide liability insurance and workman's compensation covering both students and faculty while participating in the training.

D. The Over 21 project was designed and implemented in the East Bay area to establish a full time continuing education program for young adults with the most severe multiple handicaps (including physical, sensory or behavioral disabilities in addition to mental retardation). In the project's first year, 20 students were served on the Laney Community College campus in Oakland. Instruction occurs in a variety of age-appropriate, socially integrated, natural environments, including: cafeteria, restrooms, quad, sports facilities, campus mailroom, newspaper office, etc. In addition, the program provides ongoing, systematic, data-based instruction that results in measurable acquisition of functional, age-appropriate skills. Initially funded via a contract with the Department of Developmental Services,

Over 21 currently incorporates special education, developmental services, community colleges and state university resources. The major problem currently faced by the project is long term funding.

E. The University of San Diego (U.S.D.), in the summer of 1983, instituted an extended program for fifteen youth who had previously attended self-contained classes on an elementary school site. There are currently forty youth and adults from five segregated or age-inappropriate school sites receiving community-based training on the U.S.D. campus. Student participants are employed in a variety of positions including: food services, ground work, physical plant operation and clerical work. In addition to vocational training, students are offered age-appropriate recreation experiences, community access training and opportunities to learn domestic skills. Volunteers from the U.S.D. student body and the adjacent University high school serve as peer tutors and models. Multiple opportunities for social interactions between chronological age peers with and without disabilities are available in vocational, recreational and community settings. (For futher details, "New Faces on Campus" is referenced.)

F. Vocational Education Resource System (VERS) is a comprehensive technical assistance and information referral system designed to help vocational educators identify resource persons, exemplary programs and materials. The purpose of VERS is to

facilitate the integration of students who are handicapped, disadvantaged, limited English proficient, and migrant into regular vocational education programs and services. The project is funded by the Office of Vocational Education and the State Department of Education, via VEA Sub part II funds and is implemented by the California Institute on Human Services. Currently ending the first year of operation, VERS now provides planning assistance and consultation to 25 school districts. Approximately 10 educators are involved in the planning process in each district. VERS provides resource facilitators and consultants to assist educators in assessing local school needs, preparing school improvement plans and implementing those plans. VERS also provides resource persons to conduct workshops and on-site visits and to engage in consultation in the areas of: program administration; student assessment, placement, instruction, IEP development, curriculum design; architectural barrier removal; and financial grantsmanship.

G. Local Education Agencies in many areas of the state are conducting model programs in community-based vocational training toward successful transition. The following list is by no means all inclusive, but it does include programs in both northern and southern parts of the state and in both urban and rural settings:

-Upper Solano Special Education Service Region

trains secondary age students who have severe disabilities in community work places. Typical activities for students younger than 14 years of age include: social skills training, personal care, domestic skills, work related behavior, tool usage, travel training and clerical skills. Exploratory work training in the following areas is provided for 2-3 hours per day for students 14-17 years of age: custodial work crew, farm project, industrial arts class, and school site workshop. General work training (3-5 hours per day) for students 17-19 years of age include various work crews, e.g. Holiday Inn site. Work experience for students 19-22 years of age (5-8 hours per day) may include part-time in adult day service programs or sheltered work, but also includes supportive employment and work crews.

-The Office of Riverside County Superintendent of Schools has developed a Computerized Employer/Vocational System. This unique computer system contains several programs, which together allow the user to: establish a local employer data bank and a local training site data bank; generate vocational assessment reports; and generate tracking reports for job placement clients. The community assessment placement report identifies work groups, occupations, local employers and local training sites appropriate to the client's interests

and abilities.

-Richmond Unified School District has implemented a competitive employment training program which was developed by the Technological Employment Project (in conjunction with the Special Education Department of San Francisco State University), a secondary vocational education program for students with severe disabilities. Initiated in mid school-year 1982, this program intends to develop: 1) a systematic method of locating training sites in large industry; and 2) an effective teaching curriculum which will provide instruction in specific, technical job skills as well as generic work behaviors. Thirteen students have received training at both the Chevron Research Center and Pacific Telephone. Job skills focus on lab operations and long-distance phone operations, while general work behaviors include grooming, social interactions, travel training, etc. Program guidelines continue to be: 1) real vocational experiences; 2) at integrated job sites; 3) with ongoing public education for employers and employees.

-At the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District, high school students with severe disabilties have access to a career program at Santa Monica City College or vocational training in the community. Vocational off-school site programs are conducted

at General Telephone, Pacific Theatres, and in landscape maintenance. In addition, this district has initiated a task force of teachers and parents to develop a community-referenced curriculum for students with severe handicaps. This program is based on the assumption that these students need to acquire and perform skills necessary to participate in as many domestic, community, vocational and recreational environments as possible. Teachers, therefore, provide opportunities for participation and training in as many environments as possible through direct instruction in these environments. Environments are identified and chosen for teaching on the basis of whether non-handicapped chronological age peers use and frequent these environments. In job training for juniors and seniors, employers are requested to provide opportunities for teachers to learn the skills necessary in a specific job environment in order to effectively teach their students to perform those same jobs.

-San Francisco Unified School District provides at least 50% of the instructional day for high school students with severe disabilities in the community. Twenty students are currently provided vocational training in cooking and household cleaning. Transitional planning for these students is expected to begin in September, 1984, with assistance from the

California Research Institute.

-In Los Angeles County, two programs noted are currently on segregated sites, but are moving to integrated sites in September, 1984. At Tonopah School, students who are 13-21 years of age and who have severe disabilities spend at least two hours per day off campus. Vocational preparation and communication training are emphasized. At Pace School, in addition to community-based vocational training, staff are working with families toward facilitating job placement and maintenance. The proposed move for Pace School is to a community college campus. The priorities for this new program will include: exposure of students with severe handicaps to age-appropriate non-handicapped peers in the least restrictive environment to provide appropriate peer modeling and development of skills necessary for successful interactions in community and vocational environments; in-service/orientation of the community college students and staff to create greater understanding and acceptance of people with severe handicaps as productive participants in community environments; orientation for parents to demonstrate that individuals with a multiplicity of handicaps can develop behaviors and learn skills which enable them to engage in productive activities; documentation of successful teaching strategies; and interfacing with

public agencies.

-The Whittier Area Cooperative Special Education Program, which is a high school district consortium, provides community-based vocational training for all high school students who have severe handicaps and will initiate a transitional class in September, 1984. This will be a class without a classroom. In addition, this consortium proposes to be vendorized by their local regional center for the developmentally disabled as a public school to provide services to adults. The premise is that currently, vocational training and community college programs are not adequate for the school-leaving 22 year old who has severe disabilities. The vendorized services would include monitoring in all activities (including work), counseling, and specific independent living skills training on an as needed basis. Each adult would receive only the services necessary to him/her and would not have to go to a "facility" to receive them. A generic agency location for office space is being explored and staff will go to clients to provide service.

II. Model Programs in Other States

A. Vocational Education Alternatives (VEA) in Madison, Wisconsin, provides vocational education and training for persons aged 15-21 who have developmental disabilities and who

are in the public school system. The goals of VEA are to: help individuals who have developmental disabilities obtain the jobs or vocational education they desire; utilize generic resources; utilize and coordinate vocational services currently available to individuals in Dane County; and develop strategies for overcoming the barriers to employment and training which are frequently encountered by persons who have developmental disabilities.

B. The Adult Transition Model in Seattle, Washington, arranges for opportunities and services that will enable an individual who has developmental disabilities to enjoy successful adult living. Success is measured in terms of productivity, independence, and integration into the community. The purposes of the project are to: avoid institutionalization of young adults; prevent interruption of needed services; locate vocational and residential placements; provide individual assistance to consumers and their families in preparing for adult environments; and to facilitate planning among consumers, parents, schools, and agencies responsible for the service delivery system. The approach is primarily a case-management plan which includes activities and materials for facilitating transition.

C. The Association for the Habilitation and Employment of the Developmentally Disabled, Inc. (AHEDD) in Lemoyne, Pennsylvania, is based upon Marc Gold's "Try Another Way."

This instructional methodology states that people who cannot learn a skill by the so-called normal means may be able to learn quite well through another approach. AHEDD assumes that the more realistic the environment, the more normal the performance and behavior of the people in it. Therefore, participants are placed at work stations in private companies with AHEDD taking responsibility for training by assigning a counselor/trainer within the plant to train and supervise the workers and handle all related paperwork. Training techniques involve task analysis, task restructuring and behavior modification.

D. Florida Junior College has a Mainstreaming Center which helps students with disabilities to develop self-help skills and to arrange special services. In addition to basic support services, the college has implemented the following plan for each participant: 1) a set of courses tailored to the employability needs of each student; 2) whatever counseling and special support services that students need to adjust to and succeed in planned coursework; 3) financial compensation for students in training; and 4) at the end of the year of coursework, arrange for a 6 month paid internship in a real job requiring the skills mastered in the previous year.

E. Training Through Placement in Rhode Island provides a transition from school to work for 18-21 year olds who have

severe disabilities. Training and supervision is provided entirely by employers at a variety of private sector worksites. Staff from the project meet with employers and talk extensively about each project participant's strengths and needs, employment goals, and ability to master different tasks. Staff are on-call for 24 hours per day and intervene when problems at home or school may affect work. A full-time advocate provides assistance with SSI and other such issues while the director runs a parent group which deals with individual problems as well as with the rights of the parents and young adults.

F. University of Wisconsin and Madison Metropolitan School District have demonstrated that: "... persons with severe handicaps can be taught to perform meaningful work in nonsheltered vocational environments; public school programs can be engineered so as to provide rational and functional preparatory experiences for many of its lowest intellectually functioning students; adult service systems can be engineered so as to arrange for a reasonable number of severely handicapped persons to function in nonsheltered vocational environments; and functioning in nonsheltered vocational environments is clearly more cost-efficient than functioning in sheltered environments." (For more details, see Brown, Shiraga, et al., 1983.)

G. Project Transition is a cooperative effort of the Virginia

Department of Rehabilitative Services and the Fairfax-Falls Church Community Mental Health and Mental Retardation Services Board. Through a program of preplacement orientation within competitive job settings and on-site training following job placement, project clients (who are labeled severely handicapped) are provided with the support services required to retain competitive employment. Clients placed through the project receive competitive wages and benefits without subsidy from government funds during training and employment. (Transition in this program refers to movement from sheltered employment to competitive work and no mention is made of a referral system through secondary or postsecondary education services. However, it appears that the interagency cooperation involved provides an example for other transition programs.)

H. Project Employability in Richmond, Virginia, has been providing job training, placement and follow-up services for persons labeled "moderately to severely retarded" since 1978. The project involves local rehabilitation offices which facilitate referrals from local adult programs and provide placement in competitive employment (again, a linkage between this service and the school system is not noted). Although transition is limited in this project to movement to nonsheltered from sheltered environments, this program is one of the oldest and most successful of this type.

Curriculum

Throughout much of the current, relevant literature (e.g. Brown, Branston, et al., 1979; Certo, 1981; Wilcox and Bellamy, 1982; Freagon, et al., 1983, etc.), there appears to be recognition that the most appropriate curriculum offerings for high school students (approximately ages 16-22) who have severe disabilities are those which are individually designed to prepare each student for adult living and working environments. When selecting an appropriate curriculum (i.e. deciding what to teach) for transition, it is important to consider the learning characteristics of persons with severe disabilities. Brown, Nisket, Ford, Sweet, Shiraga, York and Loomis (1983) summarize these as follows:

1. acquisition of fewer skills than nonhandicapped peers in the course of a similar school career;
2. more direct instruction required to acquire skills;
3. regression in skills acquired is likely in the absense of frequent practice;
4. less likely to transfer or generalize skills learned in one environment to another;
5. difficulty synthesizing skills learned in one context (e.g. math, reading) to functional activities.

With these characteristics in mind, one can conclude that

the choice of a vocational curriculum and the subsequent development of individual instructional objectives are critical (Richard Haines, Personal Communication, Seattle, Washington, 1984). While there is no appropriate transitional, vocational curriculum for all individuals in all communities, there are guidelines for formulating Individual Education or Transition Plans which reflect the above learning attributes of students with severe disabilities (Bellamy and Wilcox, 1981):

1. objectives should be selected which prepare students for transitioning to integrated rather than sheltered environments;
2. these objectives should be selected on the basis of chronological rather than developmental age;
3. the settings for instruction should be relevant, non-school working environments;
4. learner objectives should be oriented toward future as well as current vocational environments;
5. outcomes should emphasize skills which decrease worker dependence; and
6. partial participation through adaptations to the vocational environment should be considered when full participation is not feasible at a given time.

The current philosophical bases of curricula for persons with severe disabilities primarily fall into developmental, remedial and functional skill models. These models may be described

as follows:

+ Developmental Model- Assumes that all individuals follow the same sequence of development and that each step in the sequence must be mastered as a prerequisite to the next step. Curriculum areas include language/cognition, social/emotional, gross/fine motor and self-help. The advantage of this model is that it is easy to assess and monitor and that it is widely used. The disadvantages are many, primarily that students with severe handicaps do not follow predictable patterns of development, skill sequences are not necessarily those required for successful adult living and finally, the model requires an ability to synthesize from curriculum content areas.
+ Remedial Skills Model- Assumes that there are commonly held beliefs about what constitutes 'normal' behavior and that the discrepancies from 'normal' behavior exhibited by students with severe disabilities can be remediated. Curriculum areas include language, self-help, domestic, community, vocational and recreational skills. The advantage of this model is that it is easily understood, age-appropriateness is stressed and the community is used for some instruction. The disadvantages include the reliance of educators for deciding what shall be taught and the emphasis on a

standardized checklist approach.

+ Functional Skills Model- Assumes that instruction must take place in natural environments and that what is taught must be decided by the student/consumer involved as well as by 'significant others.' Curriculum areas include vocational, leisure/recreational, domestic, community and interaction with nonhandicapped persons. The advantages of this model are the emphasis on skills necessary for successful adult life, use of community as the classroom and focusing on independence as the ultimate performance outcome for students. The only disadvantages are the immediate changes which must be made in administrative philosophies and staffing patterns to carry out community education.

Utililizing the learner characteristics and I.E.P. guidelines previously cited, it should be clear to the reader that the most viable transitional curriculum approach for vocational training is encompassed in the functional skills model. One common characteristic of the model vocational programs described in an earlier section is the instruction of functional vocational skills in natural, community environments.

The methodology involved in the implementation of the functional skills model was first most clearly delineated by Dr. Lou Brown and his colleagues. Others have refined and expanded upon this process. Most notably in California is the Training

Resource Group's Individualized Critical Skills Model (ICSM), developed through a contract with the California State Department of Education.

In general, this methodology consists of an extensive assessment of the current and subsequent needs of students/consumers and 'significant others' through a series of interviews and observations. The information from this assessment is used to guide the analysis of appropriate current and subsequent vocational, domestic, recreation/leisure and community environments. This environmental analysis is completed as follows:

> Step One. Describe the most relevant and functional 'least restrictive' current and subsequent (1-5 years) environments.
>
> Step Two. Analyze these environments by- a) dividing them into relevant subenvironments; and b) describing the most relevant and functional activities that take place in those subenvironments.
>
> Step Three. Determine the skills needed to participate in those subenvironments (including necessary adaptations).
>
> Step Four. Design and implement instructional programs for training those skills.

The adoption of this approach to determining locally referenced curricula is a must if transition to adult working environments is to become a statewide priority. It is not some-

thing which can be purchased or mass-produced and, therefore, meets with some resistance from teachers and administrators. However, once developed for a given community, it is relatively easy and inexpensive to update and expand depending upon changes in the local job market.

Individualized Planning

Once the functional skills curriculum has been established, individual instructional objectives which emphasize transition must be established. In this section, two critical areas of individualized planning will be addressed: 1) development of Individual Education Plans, Individual Program Plans, and Individual Transition Plans; and 2) case management. A basic assumption is that students, parents, school staff and personnel of other relevant agencies are included in all aspects of these processes.

As parents and students have the most "at stake" in transition, they should be furnished with as much information as possible to assist them in making decisions regarding employment and/or programs options. As discussed by Mc Donnell, Sheehan and Wilcox (1982), schools and service agencies are responsible for providing such information and training to students and their parents. The case manager (who may be a staff member of either an adult service agency or school) should, in addition to being an information source, assist parents/students in assessing needed services, e.g. income supports, residential alternatives, social/recreation programs, etc.

Individualized Education Plans (IEP's) have been mandatory since the passage of P.L. 94-142 and the rationale for this requirement is clear: individual needs can best be served through an individualized program which is described in mea-

surable terms to facilitate monitoring of progress toward meeting each objective. IEP's must include: a statement of the student's current level of educational functioning; annual goals and short-term objectives; specific requirements for related services; extent of participation in regular educational programs; timelines for initiation and completion of specified services; and timelines and methodologies for evaluating the achievement of objectives.

The Individual Program Plan (IPP) is the label often used for a plan comparable to an IEP and typically prepared by a case management agency, e.g. a regional center for the developmentally disabled. Participation by students/clients and their parents/guardians/conservators is federally mandated for the development of the IEP and similar participation in the development of the IPP is required by California state law.

In addition to IEP's and IPP's, this report recommends that Individual Transition Plans (ITP) be required for each student at least four years prior to graduation. Parents and appropriate adult services agency personnel must be involved in developing ITP's. As mentioned in a earlier section, California's Education Code (section 56450) mandates that information be disseminated regarding coordination of career and vocational education services and also (section 56345) requires that IEP include prevocational, vocational, career education and/or work experience, <u>when appropriate</u>. It can

no longer be assumed that there are any students for whom such planning is not appropriate.

There are currently a number of methods in practice for developing Individual Transition Plans. For example, the Adult Transition Model (Horton, Maddox and Edgar, 1983) offers a sequence of step-by-step strategies, e.g.:

Strategy 4.1 Local education agency teacher, student and service agency case manager (if appropriate) develop vocational transition goal.

Required Actions-

4.1.1 Review training needs for postschool environments.

4.1.2 Develop transition goal statement.

4.1.3 Finalize goal with significant others at IEP meeting.

Materials-

Transition Goal Statement

The transition goal statement may be simply a determination of the type of vocational services needed by the student, or it may be more detailed in outlining specific vocational activities which will help prepare students for subsequent, postschool environments.

Another critical aspect of individual transition planning is the monitoring and evaluation of such plans once 'graduation'

occurs. Interagency agreements between the Department of Education and Regional Centers for the Developmentally Disabled will facilitate this necessary case management. Such an agreement must delineate the responsibilities of both agencies in follow-up.

While most individuals who are severely disabled are regional center clients, many are not eligible for regional center services. Which shall be the case responsible agency for these individuals? One possibility would be the LEA through its' adult education component as suggested in the Whittier Cooperative Special Education Program. Whatever the agency, follow-up must be assured for these students or successful transition will be inhibited and movement to more restrictive, sheltered environments likely.

Demographics

In order that sytematic planning be accomplished which will facilitate the transition from school to successful adult living, demographic projections must be made by SELPA's. Data collection should be initiated at least 3-4 years prior to a student's graduation.

The information to be accumulated by SELPA's should include descriptions of behaviors which affect job placement. In this area, Wehman, Hill and Koehler (1979) suggest the following: frequency of on-task behavior; degree of independent mobility; communication skills; degree of self-initiated work behavior; frequency and types of trainer prompts required; appropriateness of social skills; and the presence of concomitant handicaps, e.g. absenteeism, tardiness, appearance, etc.

In addition, characteristics of students aged 16-22 must be made available to local regional centers for the developmentally disabled, rehabilitation offices and community colleges. These characteristics should include: age; disability type; residence type and location; work history; and projections for types of services needed within 1, 5 and 10 years.

Service projections should be accumulated with regard to current and subsequent vocational, domestic, recreational/leisure and community environments. Once these worker behaviors and service needs are collated, a comprehensive local

and statewide transition needs assessment can be developed. Such an assessment would pinpoint school and postschool training responsibilities in both the short and long term. In addition, it would initiate the type of case-management services necessary to maintain those transition services to move successfully from special education to adult living.

Interagency Planning/Systems Change

The concept of "transition" aims at reforming the connections between career education, special education at the secondary level, rehabilitation and postsecondary opportunities. None of the reform strategies presented thus far can be implemented without at least some redesign of California's existing systems for providing vocational/career education and training, job placement and follow-up, and support services to persons with severe disabilities. Three major points with regard to any proposed systems change must be noted at the outset:

1. Any change should cause as little disruption as possible to services for and lives of people with severe disabilities.
2. Some recommendations are for major overhauls in the existing service delivery system and thus will probably not affect the current generation of high school students with severe disabilities. However, initial steps toward implementing recommendations can improve services even within existing structures.
3. Maximum involvement and commitment of all participants (service providers, agency administrators, parents and consumers of services) is required to facilitate individual, local and statewide improvements in services. All people on whom changes will

have an impact must participate in and support the philosophies behind the changes if new cooperative arrangements are to be implemented and maintained.

In 1982, the California State Council on Developmental Disabilities established a Select Committee on Adult Services to examine education and (day) training services provided to adults who have developmental disabilities. Although the recommendations of the Committee have not been acted upon and, in fact, caused a great deal of controversy when released, the premise of the Committee's work is relevant to the subject at hand. Based upon the principles of normalization and least restrictive environment, it is preferable to "... shift some or all of the funding, administration and provision of services from specialized, private sector service providers to general public service providers." Specific recommendations from the Committee which clearly have an impact upon transition services include:

- Expand the service roles of Adult Education and Community Colleges while reducing the roles of the Departments of Developmental Services, Rehabilitation and Health Services.
- Expand the role of the Employment Development Department to serve adults with developmental disabilities.
- Create incentives for non-profit organizations and private industry to provide more work training

at the job site.

- Develop program standards, rates based upon standards, and facility accreditation/certification procedures.
- Establish service entitlement for adults to education, training and support services.

With regard to the role of community colleges in the transition process, two of the model programs discussed earlier (Over 21 and Pace School) use such campuses for programming while others have suggested sites at such campuses as job stations. In order to examine critical issues in expanding the involvement of community colleges in the education and transition of students with severe disabilities, a meeting entitled "Community Colleges and Life Long Learning for Handicapped Students" is being held in Sacramento on May 15-16, 1984. A supplement to this report will be prepared to incorporate any recommendations developed at that meeting which may be relevant to the transition discussion herein.

Prior to the consideration of the full scale systems change recommended above, we should investigate both content and implementation of existing statewide and local interagency agreements. Many such agreements exist (e.g. between the Department of Rehabilitation and Department of Developmental Services for the Habilitation Services program, between the Department of Education and Department of Developmental Services for education of both State Hospital resi-

dents and community residents, between local education agencies and the Department of Rehabilitation), but implementation and effectiveness vary greatly. For example, while 40-50% of all high school students attend school districts which have memos of understanding with the Department of Rehabilitation, the statewide interagency agreement between the Department of Rehabilitation and State Department of Education merely suggests informal agreements at the local level. With or without formal agreements, cooperation between departments which provide service components necessary to the successful transition and adult living of people with developmental disabilities is critical. A national study completed in 1982 (Ashby and Bensberg) found the following activities to be common in the successful implementation of interagency agreements:

1. A broadly based interdisciplinary team from participating agencies was established.
2. Team members from participating agencies agreed upon a plan of action.
3. The identification of the handicapped students was initiated immediately.
4. Team members spent considerable time in developing community relations and the education of of the community concerning the interagency approach.
5. Each agency did its task to keep students moving

through the system. Several individuals cooperated to coordinate the flow of handicapped students through the program. Someone was assigned to follow each student through the program.

6. There was a continuous sharing of information.
7. A multidisciplinary approach was used in making decisions.
8. School based teams coordinated closely with administrators.

An illustration of this coordination can be reiterated in the successful rehabilitation rate for students referred for rehabilitation services by education agencies. According to the California Department of Rehabilitation, students referred by education agencies through the guidelines established in the D.R./D.O.E. interagency agreement, have a higher incidence (49.4% versus 37%) of becoming successfully rehabilitated. (As noted in an earlier section, this statistic is not specific to students with severe disabilities, but suggests the benefit of coordinated planning.)

The notion of rehabilitation/education partnerships is not new. Gold (1973) reported on programs operated jointly by school systems and state departments of vocational rehabilitation since 1964. However, more recent successes (e.g. Project Interdependence and Project Workability in California) demonstrate the continuing need for the development of partnerships both among public agencies and between the public and

private sectors. The value of public/private partnerships cannot be overemphasized. Industry dictates employment requirements for the future which, in turn, must be translated into curriculum and practicum requirements at local secondary schools. In addition, an expertise uniquely exists in the private sector for providing job training and employment opportunities for students with severe disabilities.

The Private Sector Youth Connection (Schilit and Lacey, 1982) describes a private sector initiative in which youth education and employment training focus on school to work planning. Unfortunately, this model, which includes curriculum revitalization, teacher internships in business/industry and school-business partnerships, seems to ignore students who have disabilities. There is every reason to assume, however, that with effective awareness training such models could include students with severe disabilities. Attention should, therefore, be paid to the criteria (in the Private Sector Youth Connection) found to be correlated with successful school to work programs. These include:

1. Commitment of school superintendents and company chief executive officers is fundamental.
2. Local Chambers of Commerce and other business associations effectively mobilize city-wide (or area) resources.
3. Provide ample time and resources for planning prior to program start up.

4. Start with a small manageable pilot effort with potential for growth.
5. An evaluation design built in from the start provides timely feedback on performance and results.
6. Corporate in kind services and personnel supplement school funding.
7. Quality staff are crucial particularly a program director trusted and respected by educators and business leaders.
8. Involve employers in identifying specific aptitudes and skills to match youth to jobs/training. Careful attention to screening assures successful experiences for youth and companies.
9. Structure pre-employment training to address local employer expectations and requirements.
10. Companies are willing to train or provide temporary jobs for in school youth since no permanent job commitment is required up front.

Fiscal Implications

It is not the cost of funding transition services per se that is to be addressed here. Rather, the fiscal implications of successful vocational training and transition as opposed to maintaining individuals with severe disabilities in sheltered employment and/or dependent upon adult services will be explored. Two other critical fiscal issues, i.e. incentives for employers to hire individuals with severe disabilities and income disincentives for individuals will be addressed in the next sections of this report.

According to a study conducted by Region IX (which includes California) of the Rehabilitation Services Administration, "... the amount of dollars spent on rehabilitations are returned to the Federal Government at an approximate life time rate of $35.00 returned through taxes for each $1.00 spent on rehabilitation. This is particularly important in the case of young people who have an entire working career ahead of them, thus, probably increasing the returns to the Government beyond the 35:1 ratio." Before being overly optimistic with regard to this staggering statistic, it should be noted that these "rehabilitations" do not typically involve persons with severe disabilities. Nevertheless, data indicate that a positive return on an investment in vocational training can be expected for this population as well.

For example, as discussed by R.C. Smith (1983), the Marc

Gold program with Motorola in Austin, Texas, involved 10 individuals with severe disabilities who progressed from drawing $68,743 in public assistance the year prior to training to paying $6,111 in federal taxes in the year after the training. "That is a turnaround of $74,854 in taxes in one year-almost half of the $150,000 cost of the program. An employment program that returns full costs in two years, leaving its clients with a lifetime ahead of them of tax-paying rather than tax-consuming, has to be a stunning success."

In addition, Brown, Shiraga, et al. (1983) point out that the cost per person in most sheltered vocational environments has been reported to range from $3,738 to in excess of $5,000 per year. While it is difficult to compare the costs of sheltered as opposed to nonsheltered environments, data suggests that "... significant savings can be realized when severely handicapped persons are prepared to function in nonsheltered environments.

To illustrate, Brown, et al. state that the average cost to the Dane County Unified Services Board of maintaining an individual in a sheltered environment in Madison, Wisconsin is approximately $5,251 per year while the cost of maintaining an individual in a nonsheltered environment is approximately $1,681 per year. If adjusted for differences in program time, the annual cost per person for nonsheltered environments would be $2,303.

Two questions seem obvious from this data. First, "Why

is it so costly to maintain one severely handicapped adult in a sheltered environment? The primary reason is that excessive amounts of money are required for overhead at the expense of direct training services. "In nonsheltered environments, those responsible for training and supervision are not paying for light, equipment, supplies, heat, rent, etc., at the workplace."

Second, "Are those in sheltered environments less intellectually and/or physically capable than those who function in nonsheltered environments?" Follow-up studies in Madison indicate that "... there were more graduates in nonsheltered environments who were nonverbal, nonambulatory, visually or auditorily impaired, deaf, blind, cerebral palsied, and who were referred to as within the severe as opposed to the moderate range of mental retardation..." than in sheltered environments.

Brown and his colleagues also suggest guidelines for determining the cost effectiveness of training. "Cost efficiency refers to the economic and other returns realized from a financial investment. Two ways to determine cost efficiency are to evaluate the relative cost of programmatic outcomes and to consider the relative productivity of individuals." They suggest that preparing individuals for nonsheltered environments is more cost effective for several reasons, primarily that the cost of producing nonmeaningful work in sheltered environments is considerable and lifelong

in nature (e.g. administration, transportation, etc.)

Finally, Brown, et al. summarize several studies which indicate that an individual in nonsheltered employment could be expected to earn more than the cumulative cost of training, placement, and follow-up services within 10 years. "If that same individual had been employed in a typical sheltered setting, the earnings would never exceed the training costs, and the cumulative cost over 10 years would be $50,276."

Similarly, the Arizona Vocational Rehabilitation Cost-Benefit Model, which compares program effectiveness to program cost, reveals that individuals who were rehabilitated in state fiscal year 1983:

- will in their first year of employment earn a taxable income of $11,839,637;
- will contribute over $2,841,512 in taxes and social security payments in their first year of employment;
- will reduce the amount of government benefits that would otherwise be paid during the remainder of their working lifetime by $2,196,002;
- will contribute a total of $7,882,601 into the social security fund over their working lifetimes;
- will in their working lifetime pay $30,554,478 in federal taxes; and
- will contribute a lifetime total of $8,823,807 in taxes to the state.

Furthermore, the Arizona Rehabilitation Services Administration has been successful in maintaining the income cost-benefit ratio above $10.00 for each dollar spent despite rising costs and an increased number of persons with severe disabilities being served.

An example of cost effectiveness in California is that of Project Workability (which was described in an earlier section). According to a report by the Auditor General of California (quoting the U.S. Department of Education estimates) removing one person from public assistance saves $6,000 to $10,000 annually. One Workability program director stated that four students who would otherwise have been unemployed and receiving public assistance obtained employment as a result of this project. She estimated that employment of these students resulted in an annual cost savings of $24,000 to the state and federal governments (for further details, the Auditor General's report is referenced). It also demonstrates contributions to society by people with severe disabilities.

Legislative Implications

In previous sections of this report, strategies for implementing an effective transition process have been discussed within the context of an accepted commitment, nationally and statewide, to transition of people with severe disabilities from school to successful adult living as a priority. Although the demonstrated positive outcomes of such strategies should ideally be enough to facilitate their implementation, a legislative mandate is undoubtedly the best approach, both from a policy and fiscal standpoint.

In 1983, both New York and Massachusetts enacted legislation affecting the eligibility for and referral to adult services of students receiving special education. Both of these laws (Chapter 688 in Massachusetts and Chapter 570 in New York) acknowledge the needs of people with severe disabilities for continued services after they reach the age of twenty-two. They also mandate a referral process and development of a transitional plan.

California's commitment to a community-based service delivery system for adults with developmental disabilities was formalized several years earlier, with the passage of the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act in 1976. However, successful transition from school to adult living with necessary support services in place continues to require improved coordination of services, more efficient referral processes between schools

and adult services agencies and increased collaboration between the public and private sector. Furthermore, income disincentives to seeking competitive employment must be eliminated and incentives to employers to hire individuals with severe disabilities must be maintained and publicized in order to address all of these issues.

Clearly, both federal and state legislative initiatives must be suggested. Based upon federal law a major disincentive to seeking and retaining competitive employment is an individual's fear of losing income supports and medical benefits. Extended Medicaid and social services benefits available to individuals with severe disabilities who remain employed would certainly remove a significant barrier to successful transition. Legislation is currently being considered in Congress to make permanent the extension of medical coverage for people with severe disabilities. (Another related issue is that of insufficient federal funding for in-home support services for people with severe disabilities. Recent literature suggests that "... most severely disabled people are not good candidates for work until they get shelter and a style of living that will accomodate work. " - R.C. Smith, 1983)

At the State level, legislation is needed to ensure:

- full integration of students with and without disabilities on school and work sites;
- interagency agreements which specify fiscal and legal responsibilities related to transition;

- expansion and coordination of transition efforts of secondary, postsecondary and graduate educational institutions (as proposed in ACR 88);
- inclusion of prevocational education in IEP's for all students with severe disabilities in kindergarten and grades 1-6 or pupils of comparable chronological age;
- inclusion of vocational education, career exploration and work experience in IEP's for all students with severe disabilities in grades 7-12 or of comparable chronological age and until graduation;
- pre-service and in-service training of teachers and administrators as well as training appropriate adult service agency personnel and parents to develop Individual Transition Plans (ITP's);
- development of ITP's (as a component of IEP's) for all students with severe disabilities aged 16-22;
- adoption of a functional skills and locally referenced curriculum model for all students with severe disabilities by all local education agencies;
- opportunities for students with severe disabilities to attend classes on community college campuses rather than in elementary or high schools when college is more age appropriate;
- establishment and maintenance of local committees

including representatives of schools, adult service agencies and business to plan and coordinate transition services (in cooperation with private industry councils);

- electronic data collection regarding skills and needs of students with severe disabilities as well as available services (i.e. education and post-school services) and their location.

Next-Step Plans

This report is the beginning of an effort to plan for the transition of students with severe handicaps from school to adult living in California. Many of the strategies discussed herein would take several years to implement, even without allowing time for the inevitable debate regarding systemic change. During the planning process, careful consideration of the recommendations of the Select Committee on Adult Services cited earlier is suggested. In the short-term, however, further work in this area can proceed without disruption of existing programs.

Activities which are recommended to the California State Department of Education as immediate follow-up to this report are:

+ Survey all SELPAs in California regarding their transition efforts and the presence of community-based vocational training programs.
+ Survey special education graduates (since 1979) and/or their parents in a sample of SELPAs with and without transition efforts and/or community-based vocational training programs with regard to- current employment status, wages earned, frequency of job changes, satisfaction with current living and working situation, etc.
+ Evaluate effectiveness of interagency agreements

between-

-local education agencies and Department of Rehabilitation

-State Department of Education, Department of Rehabilitation and Employment Development Department on Project Workability

-State Department of Education, Office of Special Education and the Department of Developmental Services

against criteria suggested herein.

+ Draft interagency agreements (statewide and at local levels) where needed to establish a commitment to integrated, community-based vocational training and to coordinate transitional services between the Department of Education, Department of Rehabilitation, Department of Developmental Services, Employment Development Department and Community Colleges.
+ Review and evaluate designs of successful public/private partnership models to determine how they are created, how they work best, and how expertise and capital resource sharing is economically and politically feasible.
+ Become actively involved in the State Job Training Coordinating Council to help focus the attention of state-level planning on the inclusion of students with severe disabilities in JTPA programs.
+ Interview students approaching graduation regarding

their training and perceptions about transition.

+ Consider using special education graduates who are living successfully (i.e. with regard to productivity, independence and participation) to evaluate existing programs and initiate self-advocacy training in the schools.
+ Train parents to facilitate effective transition through participation in the development of the Individual Transition Plan (ITP).
+ Mandate development of ITPs for all special education students.
+ Develop a statewide data collection process to collate necessary demographic information.
+ Mandate (statewide) the adoption of a functional skills and locally referenced curriculum.
+ Sponsor research to evaluate and weigh the relative impact of criteria listed in Attachment B regarding their correlation with successful transition.
+ Convene a formal, statewide Transition Work Group composed of representatives of the State Departments of Education, Rehabilitation, Postsecondary Education, Employment Development, and Private Industry Councils, state and local Chambers of Commerce, Independent Living Centers, Industry Education Councils and the California Business Roundtable.

Conclusion

The educational system can no longer be satisfied with student growth and development for its own sake, surrendering a meaningful contributing role for some students because of the complexity of their disabilities and the underdevelopment of teaching systems. The contemporary power of teaching methodology and technology make the acceptance of low expectations both irresponsible and unprofessional.

Thus, if we assume that paid work in an unsheltered, integrated setting is both possible and desirable, we will begin to train students with career exploration and community participation as major parts of their curriculum and we will provide incentives for public/private partnerships and service delivery systems which collaborate to prepare students for independence rather than reliance on public support. Through planning and action based upon the principles of self-determination, dignity of risk and the right to live and work in a variety of natural environments, we will provide throughout the school years as well as in the transition period, services which enhance individual development and enable students who have handicaps to experience a smooth transition from special education into the world of meaningful work.

References

Ashby, S. & Bensberg, G.L. Cooperative occupational preparation of the handicapped. In Tindall, L.W., Gugerty, J. and others. Vocational education models for linking agencies serving the handicapped: handbook on developing effective linking strategies. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Vocational Studies Center, 1982.

Bellamy, G.T., Wilcox, B., Mc Donnell, J.J., & Sowers, J. Improving vocational services for severely handicapped indivdiuals: strategies for parent involvement. Eugene: University of Oregon, 1982.

Bellamy, G.T., & Wilcox, B. From school to what? transition services for students with severe handicaps. Eugene: University of Oregon, 1981.

Bellamy, G.T., Rhodes, L.E., Bourbeau, P.E., & Mank, D.M. Mental retardation services in sheltered workshops and day activity programs; consumer outcomes and policy alternatives. Paper presented at the National Working Conference of Vocational Services and Employment Opportunities, Madison, Wisconsin, 1982.

Bellamy, G.T., Sheehan, M.R., Horner, R.H. & Boles, S.M. Community programs for severely handicapped adults; an analysis. Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped, 1980, 5, 307-324.

Belmore, K. & Brown, L. A job skill inventory strategy designed for severely handicapped workers. In N. Haring and D. Bricker (Eds.), Teaching the severely handicapped, V. 3, Columbus: Special Press, 1978.

Bercorici, S. M. Barriers to normalization. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1983.

Bronston, W. (Chairperson),Report to the California State Legislature, Project Interdependence, Sacramento, 1984

Brown, L., Branston, M.B., Hamre-Nietupski, S., Pumpian, I., Certo, N., & Gruenewald, L. Strategy for developing chronological age appropriate and functional curricular content for severely handicapped adolescents and young adults. Journal of Special Education, 1979, 13 (1), 81-90.

Brown, L., Ford, A., Nisbet, J., Sweet, M., Donnellan, A. & Gruenewald, L. Opportunities available when severely handicapped students attend chronological age appropriate regular schools. TASH Journal, 1983, 8 (1), 16-24.

Brown, L., Pumpian, I., Baumgart, D., VanDeventer, P., Ford, A., Nisbet, J., Schroeder, J., & Gruenewald, L. Longitudinal transition plans in programs for severely handicapped students. Exceptional Children, May, 1981, 624-630.

Brown, L., Branston-McClean, M.B., Baumgart, D., Vincent, L., Falvey, M., & Schroeder, J. Using the characteristics of current and subsequent least restrictive environments in the development of curricular content for severely handicapped students. AAESPH Review, 1979, 4 (4), 407-424.

Brown, L., Shiraga, B., Ford, A., Nisbet, J., VanDeventer, P., Sweet, M., York, J. & Loomis, R. (Draft) Teaching severely handicapped students to perform meaningful work in nonsheltered vocational environments. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1983.

Brown, L., Nisbet, J., Ford, A., Sweet, M., Shiraga, B., York, J., & Loomis, R. The critical need for nonschool instruction in educational programs for the severely handicapped student. TASH Journal, 1983, 8 (3), 71-77.

California State Assembly Office of Research, Training tomorrow's workers. Sacramento, 1983.

California State Auditor General, The state's project workability has improved the coordination of services and the employability of handicapped students. Sacramento, 1984.

California State Council on Developmental Disabilities, Report on wage requirements and performance expectations of sheltered workshops serving persons with developmental disabilities (Draft). Sacramento, 1983.

California State Council on Developmental Disabilities, Report to the planning and evaluation committee. Sacramento, 1983.

California State Department of Education, Vocational preparation for special education students at the secondary level. Sacramento, 1981.

California State Department of Education (Contract with the Training Resources Group), Individualized critical skills model. Sacramento, 1982.

California State Department of Education, Special education programs, a composite of laws, education code- part 30. Sacramento, 1984.

California Research Institute, Review of literature: integration of students with severe disabilities into the least restrictive environment. Sonoma State University, 1983.

Center for Inservice Training and Program Development, Implementation of quality educational service systems for severely handicapped children and youth: statewide plan. Seattle, 1983.

Certo, N. An analysis of selected characteristics of educational services for severely handicapped students. In M.E. Snell (Ed) Systematic instruction for the moderately and severely handicapped. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1981.

Freagon, S., Wheeler, J., Hill, L., Brankin, G., Costello, D., & Peters, W.M. A domestic training environment for students who are severely handicapped. JASH, 1983, 8 (4), 49-61.

Galloway, C. Employers as partners. Sonoma State University: California Institute on Human Services, 1982.

Galloway, C. The majic of ellensberg. The Washington State Developmental Disabilities Council and the Washington State Division of Developmental Disabilities, 1982.

Gold, M.W. Did I say that? Champaign: Research Press, 1980.

Gold, M.W. Research on the vocational habilitation of the retarded: the present, the future. In N.R. Ellis (Ed) International review of research in mental retardation. Volume 6, New York: Academic Press, 1973.

Girardeau, F.L., Butterfield, E.C. The case for nondiscriminatory habilitation of developmentally disabled citizens. Kansas City: Kansas Center for Mental Retardation, 1978.

Haines, R. Personal communication. Seattle, Washington, 1984.

Hart, J., Moilanen, M.S., & Bensman, A.S. Transitional rehabilitation: another step toward community living. Rehabilitation Literature, 1983, 4 (5,6), 149-152.

Hill, M. & Wehman, P. Cost benefit analysis of placing moderately and severely handicapped individuals into competitive employment. TASH Journal, 1983, 8 (1), 30-38.

Horton, B., Maddox, M., & Edgar, E. The adult transition model: planning for postschool services. Single Portal Intake Project, University of Washington, Seattle, 1983.

McDonnell, J., Sheehan, M., & Wilcox, B. Effective transition from school to work and adult services: a procedural handbook for parents and teachers. Eugene: University of Oregon, 1982.

Miller, C.J. A study of the relationship of vocational education systems to the local job market for individuals with exceptional needs. Operational Services Division, Orange County Superintendent of Schools, 1983.

O'Brien, J. The principle of normalization: a foundation for effective services. Atlanta: Georgia Advocacy Office, 1980.

Olivero-Knudtson, S.D., Scardino, S.P., & Addington, R.K. New faces on campus: the university as a community-based training site for youth and adults with severe disabilities. San Diego: University of San Diego, 1984.

Peters, T.J. & Waterman, R.J. In search of excellence. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

Programs for the Handicapped. Transition from school to work. November/December, Number 6, 1983.

Rehabilitation Services Administration, Region IX. A summary of approaches, concepts and procedures for development and administrating a coordinated special education and vocational rehabilitation services delivery system. (Draft) San Francisco, 1983.

Revell, W.G., Arnold, S., Taylor, B. & Zaitz-Blotner, S. Project transition: competitive employment service for the severely handicapped. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1982, Jan/Feb/Mar, 31-35.

Rosenberg, S. & Savage, S. Vocational education for the severely handicapped. California State Department of Education, Office of Special Education, Sacramento, 1981.

Rusch, F.R. & Schultz, R.P. Non-sheltered competitive employment of the mentally retarded adult: research to reality. Journal of Contemporary Business, 1982, 8 (4), 85-98.

Schilit, H. & Lacey, R. The private sector youth connection, volume 1: school to work. New York: Vocational Foundation, Inc., 1982.

Schneider, K., Rusch, F.R., Henderson, R. & Geske, T. Competitive employment for mentally retarded persons; cost versus benefits. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illnois, 1981.

Smith, R.C. Seven special kids: employment problems of handi-youth. United States Department of Labor, 1983.

Smith-Davis, J. When handicapped children grow up. National Information Center for Handicapped Children and Youth, 1983.

Steinem, G. Outragious acts and everyday rebellions. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1983.

Sweet, M., Shiraga, B., Ford, A., Nisbet, J., Graff, S., & Loomis, R. Vocational training: are ecological strategies applicable for severely multiply handicapped students? Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1982.

TASH Newsletter. TASH calls for adult service reforms. Issue 12, December, 1983.

The Technological Employment Project, Special Education Department, San Francisco State University. Annual Report, 1982-1983.

Vallejo Unified School District. Severely Handicapped Committee, 1983.

Wehman, P. Hill, J.W., & Koehler, F. Helping severely handicapped persons enter competitive employment. AAESPH Review, 1979, 4 (3), 274-290.

Wehman, P. & Hill, J.W. Preparing severely handicapped youth for least restrictive environments. TASH Journal, 1982, 7 (1), 33-39.

Wilcox, B. & Bellamy, G.T. Design of highschool programs for severely handicapped students. Baltimore: Brookes, 1982.

Wircenski, J.L., Evans, D.E., & Martorana, S.W. (Eds) The tenth annual pennsylvania conference on postsecondary occupational education: new federal legislation emphasis and postsecondary vocational education. Joint Publication of the Center for the Study of Higher Education, Division of Occupational and Vocational Studies, Department of Agriculture Education, The Pennsylvania State University, 1979.

Wolfensberger, W. The principle of normalization in human services. Downsview, Canada: National Institute on Mental Retardation, 1972.

Attachment A

DISABILITIES OF STUDENTS

WORKABILITY PROGRAM, MAY 1983

Disability	*Students	Percent
Deaf	82	4.0
Deaf-Blind	0	0.0
Hard of hearing	48	2.0
Mentally retarded	308	14.0
Multihandicapped	69	3.0
Orthopedically handicapped	51	3.0
Other health impaired	38	2.0
Seriously emotionally disturbed	89	4.0
Specific learning disability	1,381	64.0
Speech impaired	67	3.0
Visually impaired	31	1.0
Total	2,164	100.0

Source: State Department of Education

*The number of students is a count of students with disabilities. It exceeds the number of students participating (1,907) because some students have multiple disabilities.

Attachment B

CRITERIA AGAINST WHICH TRANSITION EFFORTS ARE TO BE MEASURED

+ FULL INTEGRATION
+ STATED PUBLIC POLICY
+ LAW AND ENTITLEMENTS
+ COMMITMENT TO INDIVIDUALIZED PLANNING
+ INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS/COORDINATION
+ PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS
+ USE OF COMMUNITY SITES VERSUS CLASSROOMS
+ ADEQUATE AND SUSTAINED FUNDING
+ REPLICABILITY
+ RELATIONSHIP TO MAINSTREAM EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
+ RELATIONSHIP TO MAINSTREAM SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEM
+ SEPARATELY FUNDED PILOT NOT BUILT INTO ABOVE SYSTEMS
+ LONGEVITY
+ CONFORMITY WITH LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF EXISTING SYSTEMS
+ FOLLOW-UP INTO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
+ CITIZEN/CONSUMER PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAM
+ LINKAGES WITH LOCAL EMPLOYEES
+ RELATIONSHIP OF SPECIFIC TRAINING TO LOCAL JOB MARKET